

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent claims.

The Examiner has rejected independent Claims 1 and 13 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0160745 A1 to Wang (hereinafter "Wang") and dependent claims 2-4, 6 and 14-15 as anticipated by Wang. The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections on the basis that Wang does not describe all of the limitations of these claims.

At page three of the office action, the Examiner suggests that Wang discloses, at paragraphs 92, 100 (lines 5-8), and paragraph 109 (last two lines), receiving a representation of a text file defining a format of network messages for exchange of data generated by said application. Careful review of the referenced portions of Wang reveals that no such feature is in fact disclosed. The referenced text appears to describe the use of network-independent location-aware protocol messages to communicate with different types of wireless mobile devices in different locations (see, e.g., paragraph 92, lines 4-8 or paragraph 100, lines 6-10). An exemplary format for the messages is described by Wang at paragraphs 70-85 and illustrated in FIGS. 4-7. Notably, the format described by Wang is predetermined (paragraph 70, lines 1-2). It should be emphasized that using messages that conform to a predetermined format is quite different from receiving a representation of a text file defining a format of network messages, as claimed. None of the above-noted portions of Wang describe or suggest that a format of network messages is (a) defined in a representation of a text file; or (b) received at a wireless device, e.g. as opposed the device simply having been pre-programmed to understand a predetermined format.

The applicants also respectfully disagree with the Examiner's suggestion that Wang discloses, at paragraphs 97 and 128, receiving a representation of a text file defining a format for storing data related to said application at said wireless device. Paragraph 97 appears to simply state that the three different types of messages 74, 76 and 78 are transported as data bits, data frames or data packets. Paragraph 128

describes the translation and sending of a message to a wireless mobile device. Again, the receiving of data that conforms to a particular format must be distinguished from receiving a representation of a text file defining a format for storing data at a wireless device.

As Wang does not disclose the above-referenced elements of claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection of this claim under 35 USC 102 is requested.

The above arguments are equally applicable to independent claim 13. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 102 is also requested.

As Wang does not disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claims 1 and 13, Wang cannot anticipate claims 2-4, 6 and 14-15 dependent thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-4, 6 and 14-15 under 35 USC 102 is therefore also requested.

The Examiner has additionally rejected independent Claim 7 and dependent claims 8-9 and 11-12 under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0059426 A1 to Aarnio et al. (hereinafter "Aarnio"). The applicants respectfully disagree with these rejections as well.

Claim 7 has been amended to indicate that the virtual machine software additionally comprises an object class corresponding to a data table for storing data at said wireless mobile device and an object class corresponding to a network message to be received or transmitted by said wireless mobile device. These claim amendments are supported by the application as filed, e.g. at paragraph 41 and Appendix A, FIGS. 16I, 16J, 16K and 16M.

At page five of the office action, the Examiner suggests that Aarnio discloses, at paragraph 24, object classes corresponding to actions to be taken by said wireless mobile device in response to interaction with said at least one screen. Paragraph 24 of Aarnio merely indicates that software may be written in an object-oriented programming language. The mere use of an object-oriented programming language to

write software says nothing as to whether the software will include object classes corresponding to actions to be taken by a wireless mobile device in response to interaction with said at least one screen. Moreover, Aarnio does not disclose software comprising an object class corresponding to a data table for storing data at the wireless mobile device or an object class corresponding to a network message to be received or transmitted by the wireless mobile device, in accordance with amended claim 7.

Thus, as Aarnio does not disclose or suggest each and every element of independent claim 7, it is submitted that claim 7, as well as claims 8-9 and 11-12 dependent therefrom, cannot be anticipated by Aarnio. Withdrawal of the rejection these claims under 35 USC 102 is therefore requested.

The Examiner has also rejected dependent Claims 5, 10 and 16 under 35 USC 103 as obvious over Wang in view of Aarnio. Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1; claim 10 depends (indirectly) from independent claim 7; and claim 16 depends from independent claim 13. As stated above, Wang and Aarnio do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the base independent claims. Accordingly, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established (MPEP §2143). Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 10 and 16 under 35 USC 103 is therefore requested.


Claim 13 has been amended to correct a minor typographical error.

No new matter has been added by any of the above-noted amendments.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SMART & BIGGAR

By 
Matthew Zischka
Registration No. 41,575

SMART & BIGGAR
438 University Avenue
Suite 1500, Box 111
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5G 2K8

Telephone: (416) 593-5514
Facsimile: (416) 591-1690

April 11, 2006
MZ/PAE/jbs
93422-45